BACONIANA

VOL. XXV. No. 97. OCTOBER, 1940.

EDITORIAL.

BACONIANA appears under the shadow of the death of its Joint Editor, Mr. Bertram G. Theobald.

Tributes to his long and loyal service to the Bacon Society—he was a nephew of one of its founders, Dr. R. M. Theobald—to his ripe scholarship, his literary ability and his wide knowledge of the history and traditions of BACONIANA appear elsewhere. Here is merely recorded the loss of our Society's President and one of its most valued members and friends.

THERE is no doubt that one of the purposes revealed in the Shakespeare plays was to inspire the English people with a sense of devotion to their native land.

Swinburne (*Study of Shakespeare*, p. 113) writes:—"Assuredly, no poet ever had more of national patriotism than he (Shakespeare); not even the king of men and poets who fought at Marathon and sang at Salamis; much less had any or has any one of our own, from Milton on to Campbell and from Campbell to Tennyson. In the mightiest chorus of *King Henry V* we hear the pealing ring of the same great English trumpet that was yet to sound over the battle of the Baltic." And the same great poet writes of the national side of Shakespeare's genius, the heroic vein of patriotism that runs like a thread of living fire, through the world-wide range of his omnipresent spirit.

We turn to Bacon and we find the same magnificent inspiration. His great heart embraced all men, but its love was centred upon England. His thought was directed to her increased glory and to security from those who would

assail her. He believed that it was necessary to maintain the military spirit of the people. He writes (*Essay XXIX, Of the True Greatness of Kingdoms*): "But above all, for empire and greatness, it importeth most that a nation do profess arms as their principal honor, study and occupation . . . No nation which doth not directly profess arms may look to have greatness fall into their mouths; and, on the other side, it is a most certain oracle of time that those nations that continue long in that profession (as the Romans and Turks principally have done) do wonders; and those that have professed arms but for an age have, notwithstanding, commonly attained that greatness in that age which maintaineth them long after, when the profession and exercise of arms hath grown to decay." And again, "Walled towns, stored arsenals and armories, goodly races of horses, chariots of war, elephants, ordnance, artillery and the like; all this is but a sheep in a lion's skin, except the breed and disposition of the people be stout and war-like."

Turning to Shakespeare we find the dramatist referring to Englishmen as "Feared for their breed and famous by their birth." And in those few words is Bacon's whole sentence. How proudly he depicts "that little body with a mighty heart"! His references to "this sceptered isle" in *Richard II* are much too familiar to need quotation. But England as

"Hedged in with the main,
That water-walled bulwark, still secure
And confident from foreign purposes."
(*King John*, ii, I).

"Which stands
As Neptune's park, ribbed and paled in
With rocks unscalable and roaring waters."
(*Cymbeline*, iii, I).

as "a world by itself." (*Ibid*, iii, I).

and as

"I' the world's volume,
Our Britain is as of it, but not in it;
In a great pool, a swan's nest." (*Ibid*, iii, IV).

are perhaps less familiar ideas which may be related to Bacon's idea of our ships as "walls" of England. He saw that "To be master of the sea is an abridgment of a monarchy" and "In the great fame of kingdoms and commonwealths it is in the power of princes, or estates, to add amplitude and greatness to their kingdoms; for they may sow greatness to their posterity and succession." To this great appeal to national heroism, "to sow greatness to posterity," it is not difficult to imagine how audiences at the *Fortune* and the *Curtain* must have reacted with stern delight at the pictures of English valour at Agincourt; at the representation of that great soldier Talbot dying like a lion with his noble son by his side, and been moved by the wonderful scenes of life in the England of Henry IV. The earth of England, as the Poet Laureate has written, was then as it is now a good earth and bears good fruit, even the apple of man and these scenes with many others are like an apple loft in some old barn where the apples of last year lie sweet in the straw.

Mr. Percy Allen, who is the Honorary Editor of the *News Letter* published by the Shakespeare Fellowship and who believes that Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, was the author of the Shakespeare plays, has written us in regard to the *Ashbourne* portrait, said to be one of the Stratford Shakspere, but which, it will be remembered, a Mr. Wisner Barrell claimed to be one of the Earl. Mr. Barrell proved this by means of the application of infra red and X-ray photography. Mr. Allen has been kind enough to acquaint us with the following "indisputable facts" as he describes them. "The *Ashbourne* portrait of 'Shakespeare'" he writes "is so-called because it was first discovered in or near Ashbourne which is close to the family home of the Trenthams, Elizabeth Trentham being the second Lady Oxford, whom he (the Earl) married in 1591. The portrait is now in the Folger Institute at Washington, where Mr. Barrell was permitted to take his photographs. The picture is obviously the portrait of an aristocrat. Mr. Robert M. Smith, writing on the

Ashbourne in The Shakespeare Association Bulletin (April, 1930), quotes the iconographic expert, Mr. M. H. Spielmann, as follows:—'We have thus the presentment of a handsome courtly gentleman, well formed, and of good bearing, and apparently of high breeding, thoughtful and contemplative; so sincere in expression and presentation that the picture cannot be regarded in any sense as a theatrical portrait.'

Around the year 1930, the late Father Sidney Beauclerk, after much photographic experiment, and careful comparison of the *Ashbourne* picture with the *Welbeck* portrait of Lord Oxford, reached the conclusion that the *Ashbourne* and the *Welbeck* represented the same man. I concurred; and in my *Life-Story of Edward de Vere as Shakespeare* (1931) I published composite portraits of the two pictures, expressing, at the same time, the opinion that the *Ashbourne* was, in fact, a portrait of Lord Oxford, with the date on the painting 'faked' to suit orthodox Shakesperean chronology. . . . Then, in the late nineteen-thirties, Mr. Barrell makes his discoveries—that the picture bears the coat-of-arms of the second Lady Oxford, near whose home the portrait was brought to light; and that it bears also the interwoven initials C.K., standing for Cornelius Ketel, whom we know to have painted a portrait of Lord Oxford, supposed, hitherto, to have been lost, but now it seems rediscovered as the *Ashbourne* Shakespeare. Mr. Barrell further proved that the original date of the picture had been effaced, and a later date superimposed; and that the original painting had been tampered with in other details.''

For the moment we will not comment upon this astonishing logic, but suggest that any portrait of any contemporary nobleman may have been overpainted, its date faked, a ring, coat of arms or anything else represented and labelled *Shakespeare*.

We remain quite unconvinced that the *Ashbourne* portrait was that of Lord Oxford. But, if it were, we are quite certain that this is no evidence that Oxford was the

real Shakespeare. The fact, if fact it were, would indicate no more than another attempt to discover a portrait of the Stratford Shakspere which should be at least moderately intelligent and not bovine as the *Chandos* and hydrocephalous as the *Droeshout*.

We will endeavour to enlighten Mr. Allen as to certain other facts which may possibly induce him to modify his opinion that "to any mind capable of weighing, impartially, the evidence as a whole, they form a most remarkable series of coincidences, all pointing towards Lord Oxford as Shakespeare." The *Ashbourne* picture has no pedigree whatever and was first heard of when pedigrees of original portraits of Shakspere were so greatly suspect that it was thought desirable to bring one out as a bolt from the blue, as it were. It purports to have been painted a year later than the *Janssen* (1610) and bears all the familiar iar marks of a faked antique.

To the second master of the Grammar School at Ashbourne wrote a friend in London that the latter had seen a portrait of Shakspere he was positive was genuine, but its owner only valued it as a fine picture. He was too poor to purchase it himself and he advised the schoolmaster "by all means to have it" and the schoolmaster "secured the prize." It is perhaps a little significant that the schoolmaster was, in his leisure hours, an artist too, and was able to sell his "original" for as much as £400.

As the late Mr. B. G. Theobald wrote in "*Enter Francis Bacon*," "Baconians and Oxfordians can join hands in friendly agreement over their common opposition to the orthodox Stratfordian theory and, had the Baconian theory never been started, one can easily imagine that the Oxford theory might appear plausible as a refuge from orthodox inexactitudes. But one cannot help feeling that those who profess adherence to this new proposition may not be so familiar with the Baconian theory as they imagine they are!

When students realise the overwhelming strength of the

Baconian position from whatever angle it is viewed, then nothing more is required.

Nothing hinders its general acceptance but the natural disinclination to upset cherished beliefs."

Reference has been made from time to time in BACONIANA to *The Life and Adventures of Common Sense*, published in London in 1769. The authorship of this scarce book, described as an *Historical Allegory*, has been attributed on very slender grounds to Herbert Lawrence, who is said to have been a friend of David Garrick. Its publication coincided with the Jubilee Celebrations at Stratford with which the great actor was so closely associated and may have been designed as a counter-blast to these.

It has been said that this allegory, in which *Wisdom* has his baggage stolen by *Deerstealer* is the earliest published suggestion that the plays of Shakespeare were not written by the Stratford actor. The crucial passage which appears in Vol. I, page 149, states that *Deerstealer*, "with good parts of his own, commenced Play Writer, how he succeeded is needless to say when I tell the Reader that his name was Shakespear." There is no doubt therefore whom *Deerstealer* represented, but *Wisdom* as the Unknown Shakespeare from whom *Deerstealer* committed the theft, has not hitherto been identified; the question, however, of his identity appears to have been recently answered. There was, it appears, a second edition of *The Life and Adventures of Common Sense*, identical with the first, but with a different title-page tipped in. In this, according to *The Colophon* (No. 3, New York, Pynson Printers, Inc.), *Wisdom* is identified as Bacon, whose name appears bracketed after the word and this, as far as we know, is the first time Shakespeare is identified as Bacon.

Colonel Hart's *Romance of Yachting* (1848) is given by the *Encyclopaedia Brittanica* as the first reference to the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy, but the writer of this article either knew nothing of *The Life and Adventures of Common Sense* or considered this allegory no more than

a suggestion that Shakspere of Stratford stole his reputation as Poet and Dramatist from some unknown *Widsom*. Seventy years before that, *Wisdom* had been identified as Bacon.

The *Quarterly Review* (April, 1940) contains an article entitled *Is Shakespeare's Will a Forgery?* It is written by Mr. Archibald Stalker, who argues that the Will of the Stratford actor is everything that a Will should not be; that it is as defective a document as ever went unchallenged in the Courts of literature and law; that it contains many unauthenticated deletions and insertions and its mangled condition signifies that Shakspere was helpless. Mr. Stalker comments with considerable force upon the mystery surrounding the discovery of the magnificent treasure trove and points out that, although the Rev. Joseph Green claimed to have found the document before 1747, it was not printed until 1763 by an anonymous writer who was apparently not Greene and who wrote as if Greene had never existed.

It is impossible to pursue Mr. Stalker's argument: he raises issues of considerable complexity, upon many of which only lawyers could pronounce. "They have hitherto," writes Mr. Stalker, "examined the Will on the assumption that it is genuine: if they proceed to examine it with reasonable suspicion that it might be forgery, blunders such as no lawyer would commit will be exposed and the document will be revealed as the compilation of a forger whose immunity from suspicion has rested on the impudence of his inventions and on the disposition of men to believe that great poets are witless in the conduct of affairs."

We do not think by any means that Mr. Stalker has proved his case, but he has certainly raised one for answer and, if our space permits it, we hope to consider his arguments in detail.

The subject is certainly not without interest to Baconians. The discrediting of the Stratford myth is only less

important than the establishment of Bacon as the real *Shakespeare*. Indeed many investigators of the problem, notably the late Sir George Greenwood, considered the former task should be attempted first. No one did more than he to discharge it. The case against the Stratford Shakspere presented in *The Shakespeare Problem Restated* and *Is there a Shakespeare Problem?* remains unanswered to this day. Except by Mr. J. M. Robertson and Mr. Andrew Lang, no attempt has, as far as we know, ever been made to answer it. Sir George Greenwood effectively replied to *The Baconian Heresy*, Mr. Robertson's work and *Shakespeare, Bacon and the Great Un-Known*, by Mr. Lang in two later books, *The Vindicators of Shakespeare* and *In re Shakespeare*. There has been no rejoinder and the orthodox position is so hopelessly compromised by the differences between its advocates and the devastating effect of their own research upon the manner of man the Shakespeare works reveal, that no attempt to reconcile such traditions as have reached us of the actor with our knowledge of the Poet and Playwright derived from his work has recently been made. Embroidery of the poor boy theme is no longer fashionable and it is merely argued that the dramatist must have been an actor and that the plays were written for the theatre, playhouse versions of them being published in quarto form—very "lame and impotent conclusions" as they appear to us.

We occasionally speculate how long it will be before it is realised that if Shakespeare and Bacon were really twain they were both aristocrats devoted to aristocratic tradition, both travellers, both adorning the same profession of the law, both Poets, both dramatists and lovers of the Play and the Players' art, both members of the same political faction, both holding the same religious and philosophical opinions, both declaring the same purposes in life, both pursuing the same studies, both reading the same books, sharing the same tastes, expressing the same views, using the same expressions, employing the same curious vocabulary, citing the same quotations and making the same mistakes.

In his road to the Celestial City Bunyan's Pilgrim encountered Passion and Prejudice. It is, we think, now only these that bar the way to the solution of the Shakespeare problem.

The Times announces the discovery of more marginal annotations by Shakespeare alleged to have been made in a copy of Halle's Chronicles printed in 1550. These annotations were made, it is said, with a view to the construction and language of the historical plays and there is, as might be expected, "a certain similarity of handwriting" between these notes and acknowledged Shakespeare signatures. We await the volume in which Sir John Squire (to whom the discoverer, Mr. Alan Keen, of the Gate House Clifford's Inn, has handed his material) is to tell the story of the find and survey the evidence.

In the meantime we recall Francis Bacon's inveterate practice of annotating in the margins of books he read. His chief purpose seems to have been to assist his memory for, as the late Mr. W. T. Smedley pointed out in *The Mystery of Francis Bacon*, nearly every name appearing in the text is carried into the margin without comment. The notes are also accompanied by scrolls, marks and brackets such as those discovered by Captain Jaggard in a copy of Holinshed (BACONIANA, Dec. 1936). The handwriting varies—Bacon's style as a writer varied almost as much as his handwriting—but the marginal notes are unquestionably the work of one man and that man Bacon.

IN MEMORIAM. B.G.T.

MR. B. G. THEOBALD, my friend and colleague, was Joint Editor with me of BACONIANA for four years, and his last work was the revision of MS. contributed to this number. Proofs had been sent to him by the printers for correction; these, in which he had taken so much interest, he will never see.

The morning after I received the telegram announcing his peaceful passing in sleep a letter came to me from him, written apparently in perfect health and memory and dealing with the future of BACONIANA and the possibility of resuming its quarterly publication. He urged me to meet him and this I had determined to arrange. It was, however, decreed otherwise. It is almost impossible to believe that I shall never see him or read his familiar handwriting in another letter again.

His help and collaboration in our work have been invaluable. He was a frequent contributor to BACONIANA himself, many of his articles being of great controversial value. As recently as April last he reviewed Mr. Fletcher Pratt's book, *Secret and Urgent: the Story of Codes and Ciphers*, and this was the last work appearing above the familiar initials B.G.T.

He was an expert cryptographer. His *Francis Bacon Concealed and Revealed* (London, Cecil Palmer, 1930) and *Shakespeare Sonnets Unmasked* (London, Cecil Palmer, 1929) never received from press or public the consideration undoubtedly due to them.

He was extraordinarily diligent in research, and had prepared for publication the results of much of this upon the problem of Bacon's death. I was privileged to read his MS. in Cornwall some two or three years ago, and was greatly impressed by the clarity and force of his argument.

As a speaker he was unruffled in debate and, although provoked, was never anything but courteous to an opponent; he was a most persuasive advocate in writing

and speech, his style in both being characterised by the charm of an attractive personality.

It was difficult for him to suffer the restraining hand which his long illness imposed upon his normal activities which were many and varied during recent months, and he felt very keenly his inability to write for BACONIANA. Only a short time before he died he wrote me of what seemed to be more satisfactory results of medical treatment and of his hope of at least partial recovery from the effects of that cardiac strain of which he had been warned last autumn to be careful.

Others will doubtless write of his long service to the Bacon Society and to the causes it has made its own. No one could possibly have rejoiced more than he would have done in the attainment of the Society's objects; he recently wrote me that he thought only some discovery of documents or other proof amounting to demonstration would ever break down the prejudice against what were for him the unanswerable claims of Francis Bacon to be the real Shakespeare and indeed to be much more besides.

It is, however, as the kindliest and most genial of people that I shall longest remember my late colleague; my world is the poorer for the loss of a man and of another friend.

FRANCIS E. C. HABGOOD.

It was with great grief that I learned of the passing of Bertram Theobald: I had been in close contact with him for several years and I found him a most charming colleague. He will be a great loss to the Bacon Society, for he not only had great ability as an author but had made exhaustive study of all aspects of the Bacon-Shakespeare problem. Although he was a convinced believer in the Cypher theory, he never let his own opinions on that subject and others of a controversial nature prejudice him against those who held contrary views. This was a great asset to the Society, as he held the balance evenly on a much debated question and one which had led to dissension in the past.

Upholding his own views with great ability, he was

always ready to give a fair hearing to those who thought differently. He had an even temperament which stood him in good stead as President, and no one could ever accuse him of attempting to dictate the Society's attitude to matters of controversy between its members.

Personally, my relations with him as a former Chairman of the Council and present Secretary were always of a most cordial nature, and I feel I have lost a great friend, ever ready to assist me and willing to undertake any task in the Society's interests. I shall miss him, and so, I am sure, will all who were fortunate enough to know him.

He was a very good lecturer. Time after time he undertook to give an address when no one else was available, and that in all parts of the country and at his own expense. His "*Shakespeare the Mask—Bacon the Man*" lecture was most effective, as it conveyed the known facts in a lucid manner which interested even the most orthodox of his audience. His forte was in answering questions. He was really brilliant in his replies to these, and anyone hearing them felt that he had a thorough grasp of his subject. His platform manner was always urbane, in no way aggressive, and his points were made the more effectively for that reason. He never lost his temper, even with the most provoking objector, and thus gained for himself the sympathy of his audiences, whether they agreed with him or not.

His business ability was of a high order. Letters to him were always attended to and everyone answered, generally by return of post. His correspondence was world wide, and many a new member joined the Society as a result. I think perhaps his illness was brought on owing to the work he did on behalf of the Bacon Society. It was always a joy to meet and converse with him, and as a very humble Baconian I am glad to offer this very inadequate tribute to a man most unselfish in all his ways of life, and to a good friend and loyal colleague.

I shall not look upon his like again. May he rest in peace.

VALENTINE SMITH.

BACON-SHAKESPEARE ANATOMY.

(Part V.)

By W. S. Melsome.

I RETURN once more to Bacon's analysis of the "passions, which are indeed the sicknesses of the mind." (*Life*, II, p. 7.)

Something has already been said concerning "jealousy," "wrath" and "drunkenness," and we now come to the chief causes of seditions, which are "grief" and "discontent."

In the following pages it is my purpose to trace Bacon's hand in three plays which deal with these subjects, and which were not printed before November 1623; namely, *King John*, *King Henry VIII*, and *Coriolanus*.

According to Bacon "envy" means "discontentment," which is a disease in a state "like to infection." (*Essay IX*.) The key-words, therefore, to seek will be "grief," "discontent" and "infection."

Bacon wrote an essay on "Seditions and Troubles," dated, according to Spedding, 1607-12, but which was not printed during his lifetime. It will be referred to as his "MS. essay."

In 1625 he published a longer essay upon the same subject. This will be referred to as "Essay XV, 1625."

The MS. essay is now in print, and may be found in *Works* VI (P. 589, 1870 edition). The longer essay begins on page 406 (Spedding and Heath).

For the sake of contrast and brevity I record Bacon and Nashe in italics and Shakespeare in Roman type.

Of all "*passions or sicknesses of the mind*" which are "*like to infection*," envy is one of the worst.

"*Envy . . . it is the proper attribute of the devil.*"
(*Essay IX*.)

"And devil envy say amen."
(*Troilus, II*, 3, 23.)

"*Death alone reconciles envy to virtue.*"
(*De Aug., VI, III*, Exampla Antithetorum.)

"Here no envy swells,
Here grow no damned grudges; here are no storms,
No noise, but silence and eternal sleep."
(*Titus*, *I*, 1, 152.)

"No black envy shall mark my grave."
(*H8*, *II*, 1, 85.)

"*Envy . . . it is a disease in a state like to infection.*"
(*Essay IX*.)

It is like the "envious fever" in Troilus and Cressida, by which "many are infect."
(I, 3, 133, and I, 3, 187.)

"*The Greeks . . . full of divisions amongst themselves.*"
(*Life*, *III*, p. 97),
and
"*A civil war indeed is like the heat of a fever.*"
(*Works VI*, p. 450);
hence "envious fever."

"*This envy, being in the Latin word 'invidia,' goeth in the modern languages by the name of discontentment*"
(*Essay IX*);
and this discontentment is the cause of tempests in states and quarrelling with obedience, to which we now come.

"*Tempests in state*":—

A. "*Shepherds of people had need know the calendars of tempests in state . . . And as there are certain hollow blasts of wind and secret swellings of seas before a tempest, so there are in states.*"
(*Essay XV*, 1625.)

Such a tempest there was in the time of King John, and Cardinal Pandulph says,

B. "It was my breath that blew this tempest up."
(*K. John*, *V*, 1, 17.)

Quarrelling with obedience:—

C. "*That kind of obedience which Tacitus speaketh of, is to be held suspected: 'Erant in officio, sed tamen qui mallent mandata imperantium interpretari quam exequi.'* (They attended to their duties, but yet were inclined rather to dispute the commands of their rulers than to obey them) *disputing, excusing, cavilling upon*

mandates, is a kind of shaking off the yoke, and essay of disobedience."

(*Essay XV*, 1625.)

D. "Our discontented counties do revolt;
Our people quarrel with obedience."

(*K. John, V*, 1, 7.)

E. "*When discords, and quarrels, and factions are carried openly and audaciously, it is a sign the reverence of government is lost. And reverence is that wherewith princes are girt from God, who threateneth the dissolving thereof, as one of his great judgements: Solvam cingula regum* (I will loose the girdles of kings).

(*Essay XV*; MS. only, 1612.)

F. "Now happy he whose cloak and cincture can
Hold out this tempest."

(*K. John, IV*, 3, 155.)

G. "*So when any of the four pillars of government are mainly shakened or weakened, which are Religion, Justice, Counsel, and Treasure, men had need to pray for fair weather.*"

(*MS. essay*, 1612; *Works VI*, p. 589.)

H. "It was my breath that blew this tempest up,
Upon your stubborn usage of the pope;
But since you are a gentle convertite,
My mouth shall hush again this storm of war
And make fair weather in your blustering land."

(*K. John, V*, 1, 17.)

"Blustering" means making a noise like "*hollow blasts of wind*" as in "A" above; in which we see the word "tempest" as we do in "H."

The second line of "H" tells us what "*pillar of government*" was at fault (*Religion*).

The last line of "H" and the last line of "G" contain that "*fair weather*" which "*men had need to pray for*" when there are "*tempests in states.*"

"*Cingula*" in "E" is the plural of cingulum; and cingulum, cinctura, cincture in "F," and girdle are all one. Cincture in "F" and *cingula* in "E" refer to the same verse in Isaiah. (*XLV*, 1.)

Disputing and cavilling in "C" is the same as quarrel-

ling; and "quarrel with obedience" in "D" is derived from the same passage in Tacitus as in "C." (*Hist. II*, 39.)

The references to the passage in Tacitus, and the verse in Isaiah, occur within the space of fourteen lines in Bacon's MS. essay of seditions; so they do in "King John," which was not printed before 1623. It follows, therefore, that Bacon could not have seen the printed "King John" before writing his MS. essay (1607-12). And as Bacon's printed essay was not published before 1625, it follows that the author of "King John" could not have seen it before writing the last five lines of Act IV, and the first nine lines of Act V, which contain the references to Isaiah and Tacitus. Therefore neither could have borrowed from the other except through the intermediaries of mind or manuscript.

"*The matter of seditions is of two kinds; much poverty and much discontent.*"

(*MS. Essay.*)

In "King John" it is discontent:

"Our discontented counties do revolt."

"*There is in every state (as we know) two portions of subjects, the nobles and the commonalty. When one of these is discontent, the danger is not great; for the common people are of slow motion, if they be not excited by the greater sort; and the greater sort are of small strength, except the multitude be apt and ready to move of themselves: then is the danger when the greater sort do but wait for the troubling of the waters amongst the meaner.*"

(*Essay XV*, 1625);

or,

when powers at home and discontents at home meet in one line, as they did in "King Henry VIII."

But in "King John" we read:

"Now powers from home and discontents at home
Meet in one line."

(*K. John, IV*, 3, 151.)

The "powers from home" are the French nobles, and the "discontents at home" are the commonalty in England, already incensed at the murder of Prince Arthur.

Then is the danger when the greater sort do but wait for the troubling of the water amongst the meaner.

Then "happy he whose cloak and cincture can hold out this tempest."

(*K. John, IV*, 3, 155.)

We must now leave King John for a while and consider the other two plays which, like King John, were not printed before 1623 (First Folio) and of which seditions, caused by griefs and discontents are a theme.

In his printed essay "Of Seditions" Bacon always writes "*griefs*" and "*discontentments*," but in his MS. essay it is either "*griefs*" or "*discontents*" as in Titus Andronicus:—

"Dissemble all your griefs and discontents:
You are but newly planted in your throne;
Lest, then, the people and patricians too,
Upon a just survey, take Titus' part,
And so supplant you for ingratitude."

(*Titus, I*, 1, 443.)

If "the people and patricians too" had caused trouble and taken Titus' part, we should have had another example of the nobles and the commonalty "meeting in one line."

Of these two portions of subjects the commonalty are the most important in times of "Seditions and Troubles"; therefore

"bid him strive
To gain the love of the commonalty,"

(*H8, I*, 2, 169.)

"'Tis wonderful
What may be wrought out of their discontent."

(*K. John, III*, 4, 179.)

"*The poets feign that the rest of the gods would have bound Jupiter; which he hearing of, by the counsel of Pallas, sent for Briareus, with his hundred hands, to come to his aid: an emblem, no doubt, to show how safe it is for monarchs to make sure of the goodwill of the common people.*"

(*Essay XV*, 1625.)

Bacon brings in this Briareus four times in his works;

in his Exempla Antithetorum, De Aug. *VI, III*; in Essay XXI; in Essay XV, and again in the "Advancement of Learning," 1605; where, speaking of monarchs, he ends with *"so long as by wisdom they keep the hearts of the people."*

Observe what Richard II did:

"The commons hath he pilled with grievous taxes,
And quite lost their hearts."

(*R2, II*, 1, 246.)

But what did Bolingbroke do? Even Richard

"Observed his courtship to the common people,
How he did seem to dive into their hearts."

(*Ib., I*, 4, 24.)

In Richard's case the effect was this:—

"The nobles they are fled, the commons cold,
And will, I fear, revolt on Hereford's side."

(*R2, II*, 2, 88.)

In Bolingbroke's case the result was that *"Eagle-soaring Bullingbrooke, that at his removing of household into banishment (as father Froysard threapes us down) was accompanied with 40,000 men, women and children weeping from London to the land's end at Dover."*

(*Nashe V*, p. 247.)

Bolingbroke courted Briareus, while Richard discarded him; and so, as Richard says, "The mounting Bullingbrooke ascends my throne" (*R2, V*, 1, First Folio); thus we see that Richard's "weaved-up follies" (*R2, IV*, 1, 229) were the cause of his downfall.

"Then all too late comes counsel to be heard,
Where will doth mutiny with wit's regard"

(*Ib., II*, 1, 27);

for *"when wit gives place to will and reason to affection, then folly with full sail luancheth forth"* (*Nashe I*, p. 27); and when folly launcheth forth of a man that is in reputation for wisdom and honour it causes his name to stink; even as *"dead flies cause the best ointment to stink."* (Bacon's *Ecclesiastes X*, 1.)

Briareus appears in all the plays of which seditions are a subject, although he is only mentioned once by name. (*Troilus, I*, 2, 29).

In "King Henry VIII" the word "discontent" is not used; it is either "grief" or "grievance":—

"Your subjects are in great grievance."

(*H8, I*, 2, 19.)

"The subjects' grief comes through commissions, which compel from each the sixth part of his substance, to be levied without delay."

(*Ib., I*, 2, 56.)

"This makes bold mouths."

(*Ib., I*, 2, 59.)

To understand "bold mouths" we must go back to that passage in Tacitus.

After writing "*disputing, excusing, cavilling upon mandates and directions, is a kind of shaking off the yoke, and assay of disobedience,*" Bacon adds: "*especially if in those disputings they which are for the direction speak fearfully and tenderly, and those that are against it audaciously.*"

(*Essay XV*, 1625.)

This comes after "*Erant in officio*" (They attended to their duties).

Compare the following:—

Katharine: "This makes bold mouths:
Tongues spit their duties out, and cold hearts freeze
Allegiance in them; their curses now
Live where their prayers did; and its come to pass,
This tractable obedience is a slave
To each incensed will."

Compare these lines with King John's speech:

"Our discontented counties do revolt;
Our people quarrel with obedience,
Swearing allegiance and the love of soul
To stranger blood, to foreign royalty."

(*K. John, V*. 1. 9.)

We see in each speech the weakening of home allegiance, and the quarrelling with obedience, which makes it fairly evident that the author of John's speech was also the author of Katharine's, and that both speeches had their origin in Tacitus. Further, at the end of each speech, a

similar urgency is expressed to have the business attended to, because the disease in the state is desperate; and "*to desperate diseases must desperate medicines be applied*" (*Nashe IV*, p. 27); and, of course, without a moment's delay:

"Then pause not, for the present time's so sick,
That present medicine must be minister'd,
Or overthrow incurable ensues."

(*K. John, V.* 1. 14.)

So in Henry VIII:

"I would your highness
Would give it quick consideration, for
There is no primer business."

(*H8, I*, 2, 65.)

"Diseases desperate grown by desperate appliance are relieved, or not at all."

(*Hamlet, IV*, 3, 9.)

The "bold mouths" were the poor people who, "Compell'd by hunger and lack of other means" (*H8, I*, 2, 34), spoke "*audaciously against the mandates and directions*":—

"Language unmannerly, yea, such which breaks
The sides of loyalty, and almost appears
In loud rebellion."

(*H8, I*, 2, 26.)

In the three plays which treat of seditions, the cause of the latter is always "grief" or "discontent," but the cause of the grief or discontent is very different in Coriolanus and King Henry VIII from that in King John; and to understand the cause the better we must come to Bacon's "Essay of Envy." As already stated, "*This envy being in the Latin word 'invidia,' goeth in the modern languages by the name of discontentment.*"

"*It is a disease in a state like to infection.*" (*Essay IX*, 1625.) Wolsey and Coriolanus had to contend with the gravest of all infectious diseases, namely, envy or discontentment caused by hunger; "*for the rebellions of the belly are the worst.*" (*Essay XV.*)

"*Menenius Agrippa among the Romans (a nation at that time by no means learned) quelled a sedition by a fable*"

(*Life IV*, p. 317), and these are the words of Menenius Agrippa in "Coriolanus":—

"There was a time when all the body's members
Rebell'd against the belly."

(*Coriol.*, *I*, 1, 99.)

"The senators of Rome are this good belly
And you the mutinous members."

(*Ib.*, *I*, 1, 152.)

For the rest of this fable the reader should refer to "Coriolanus" and to Plutarch's "Lives of the noble Greeks and Romans."

After telling us that "*envy is a disease in a state like to infection*," Bacon adds, "*for as infection spreadeth upon that which is sound and tainteth it, so, when envy* (*discontentment*) *is gotten once into a state it traduceth even the best actions thereof.*" (*Essay IX.*)

"What we oft do best
By sick interpreters, once weak ones, is
Not ours, or not allow'd; what worst, as oft,
Hitting a grosser quality, is cried up
For our best act."

(*H8*, *I*, 2, 81.)

And the reason why these sick interpreters cry up the worst acts and traduce the best would appear to be because "*The lowest virtues gain the praise of the common people, middle ones astonish them, but of the highest they have no sense.*" (*De Aug.*, *VI*, *III*, Exempla Antithetorum.)

"*Envy or discontentment*" is not the only disease in a state "*like to infection*," and which "*traduceth even the best actions thereof and turneth them into an ill odour.*" (*Essay IX.*) Drunkenness is another. And when this "heavy-headed revel" is gotten once into our state, it traduceth "our achievements" even "though performed at height"; takes the pith and marrow from our attribute (*Ham.*, *I*, 4); and so, causeth our name to yield an ill odour.

So it is in particular persons. Galba so angered the Roman soldiers that they traduced even his good actions

as well as his bad. "Inviso semel principe, seu bene, seu male, facta premunt." (*Tacitus, Hist. I*, 7.) (The ruler once in ill odour, his actions good or bad, make him traduced); and, "*if it come to that, that the best actions of a state, and the most plausible, and which ought to give greatest contentment, are taken in ill sense and traduced, that shows the envy great, as Tacitus saith, 'Conflata magna invidia, seu bene, seu male, gesta premunt.'*" (*Essay XV*, 1625.) (Great discontentment once kindled against him, his actions, good or bad, make him traduced.)

The "sick interpreters" are the same "bold mouths" "*qui mallent mandata imperantium interpretari quam exequi*" (*Tacitus, Hist. II*, 39); and who traduced and censured Wolsey on account of his "exactions."

Wolsey: "If I am
Traduced by ignorant tongues, which neither know
My faculties nor person, yet will be
The chronicles of my doing . . .
(for "as you know, what great ones do the less
will prattle of"—*T.N., I*, 2, 32)
. . . . let me say
'Tis but the fate of place, and the rough brake
That virtue must go through. We must not stint
Our necessary actions, in the fear
To cope malicious censurers."
(*H8, I*, 2, 71.)

It is the fate of men in great place to be envied by those beneath them, and "*those that are advanced by degrees are less envied than those that are advanced suddenly and per saltum.*" (*Essay IX.*)

Henry VII "*did use to raise them by steps; that he might not lose the profits of the first fruits, which by that course of gradation was multiplied.*" (*Hist. Hen. VII—Works III*, p. 41.)

But sometimes "Preferment goes by letter and affection, and not by old gradation." (*Oth., I*, 1, 37.)

Henry VIII raised Wolsey to the highest elevation; per saltum, and certainly not by old gradation:—

Katharine to Wolsey:

"You have by fortune and his highness' favours
Gone slightly o'er low steps."

(*H8*, *II*., 4, 112.)

And this is what Bacon has to say of men that are raised suddenly, and per saltum:—

"*Qui delicate a pueritia nutrit servum suum, postea sentiet eum contumacem. Here is signified, that if a man begin too high a pitch in his favours, it doth commonly end in unkindness and unthankfulness.*"

(*Prov. XXIX*, 21, *Adv. II*, 23, 6.)

Henry VIII began too high a pitch in his favours to Wolsey, and it ended in unkindness and unthankfulness. And the same is true of Henry VII, who began too high a pitch in his favours to Sir William Stanley after Bosworth Field; so with Elizabeth and Essex; so with James I and Robert Carr.

For "high a pitch" in Shakespeare we must turn to Richard II. (*I*, 1, 109).

If Wolsey had not made himself detested by the nobles, the common people would have had little power against him; but at the time of his speech these "sick interpreters, once weak ones," were now strong, because the nobles were only too ready and willing to help them pull Wolsey down. "*Then is the danger, when the greater sort do but wait for the troubling of the waters among the meaner*," or,

When powers at home and discontents at home meet
in one line.

As to "the rough brake that virtue must go through":—

A. "*The condition of men eminent for virtue is, as this parable well observes, exceeding hard and miserable, because their errors, though ever so small, are not overlooked. But as in the fairest crystal every little grain or little cloud catches and displeases the eye, which in a duller stone would scarcely be noticed; so, in men of eminent virtue, their smallest faults (or defects) are readily seen, talked of, and severely censured.*"

(*De Aug., VIII, II, parabola XI*, 1623.)

B. "These men
Carrying, I say, the stamp of one defect . .
. . Their virtues else, be they as pure as grace, . .
. . Shall in the general censure take corruption
From that particular fault."

(*Ham.*, *I*, 4, 30.)

C. "*Whereas in ordinary men they* (these faults or defects) *would be either entirely unnoticed or readily excused*"

because

D. "Folly in fools bears not so strong a note
As foolery in the wise."

(*L.L.L.*, *V*, 2, 75.)

"A" and "C" are continuous, and are parts of Bacon's explanation of Ecclesiastes *X*, 1.

"B" is from the last 22 lines of Hamlet's pre-ghost speech (Quarto 1604) which are based upon Ecclesiastes *X*, 1, and Tacitus.

"D" was written by a man whose mind was busy with "folly, in wisdom hatch'd," (*L.L.L.*, *V*, 2, 70) which obviously refers to Ecclesiastes *X*, 1; therefore, beyond all question, "A," "B," "C" and "D" were borrowed from, or inspired by, this same parable.

"*Above all, those are most subject to envy, which carry the greatness of their fortunes in an insolent and proud manner.*"

(*Essay IX.*)

Wolsey and Coriolanus were both proud and insolent, and, as we shall see, both argued against giving way to the common people, or even "*speaking fearfully and tenderly for the direction*"; and the reason would appear to be that "*when envy* (*or discontentment*) *is gotten once into a state . . . . there is little won by intermingling of plausible actions; for that doth argue but a weakness and fear of envy.*"

(*Essay IX.*)

"They tax our policy and call it cowardice."

(*Troilus*, *I*, 3, 197.)

Therefore "We must not stint
Our necessary actions, in the fear
To cope malicious censurers";

(*H8*, *I*, 2, 76.)

for, "If we shall stand still,
In fear our motion will be mock'd or carp'd at,
We should take root here where we sit, or sit
State-statues only."

(*Ib.*, *I*, 2, 85.)

What will the rabble say?

" 'We did request it;
We are the greater poll, and in true fear
They gave us our demands.' Thus we debase
The nature of our seats, and make the rabble
Call our cares fears."

(*Coriol.*, *III*, 1, 133.)

"*Which hurteth so much the more, as it is likewise usual in infections, which, if you fear them, you call them upon you.*"

(*Essay IX.*)

"So shall my lungs
Coin words till their decay 'gainst those measles,
Which we disdain should tetter us, yet sought
The very way to catch them" (or to call them upon us).

(*Coriol.*, *III*, 1, 7, 6.)

"I say again,
In soothing them (*by intermingling of plausible actions*)
we nourish 'gainst our senate
The cockle* of rebellion, insolence, sedition,
Which we ourselves have plough'd for, sow'd, and scatter'd,
By mingling them with us, the honour'd number."

(*Ib.*, *III*, 1, 68.)

Whereas "*the true way is to stop the seeds of sedition and rebellion in their beginnings.*"

(*Works VI*, p. 80.)

And as it is in states, so it is in particular persons; and,

"If we suffer
Out of our easiness and childish pity

---

* 'Cockle'; see kokkos, or coccum; a berry or seed: seed of re ellion . . . plough'd for, sow'd, and scatter'd.
"Cockle is the grain we reap." (Nashe I, p. 117).
"Sow'd cockle reap'd no corn." (L.L.L., IV, 3. 383).

To one man's honour, this contagious sickness,
Farewell all physic: and what follows then?
Commotions, uproars, with a general taint
Of the whole state."

(*H8. V*. 3. 24.)

This "measles," "contagious sickness," "with a general taint of the whole state" may be compared with Bacon's "*infection*," "*tainteth*" and "*turneth into an ill odour the best actions of a state*."

It is interesting to find these happenings (the tainting and corrupting by infection) applied to states, to particular men, and to things in general, not only by Bacon but also by the author, or one of the authors, of the plays; but I have called attention to this in dealing with Ecclesiastes X, 1.

Heresy is another disease in a state "like to infection." The speech just quoted (*H8, V*, 3, 24) is by Gardiner concerning Cranmer, whom he calls

"A most arch heretic, a pestilence
That does infect the land."

(*H8, V*, 1, 45.)

In the time of James I some people looked upon religious opponents as rank weeds. Bacon, addressing judges in the Star Chamber, says of "*the hollow church-papist; St. Augustine hath a good comparison of such men, affirming that they are like the roots of nettles, which themselves sting not, but yet they bear all the stinging leaves. Let me know of such roots and I will root them out of the country*."

(*Life VI*, p. 213.)

Similarly, Gardiner, speaking of Cranmer, says,

"He's a rank weed, Sir Thomas, and we must root him out."

(*H8, V*, 1, 52.)

This to prevent "Commotions, uproars, with a general taint of the whole state."

Similarly, "*Treason . . . a contagion of the heart and soul*."

(*Life V*, p. 155.)

"A most contagious treason come to light."

(*H5, IV*, 8, 22.)

Coriolanus, the traitor, "is a limb that has but a disease," but

"He's a disease that must be cut away."

(*Coriol.*, *III*, 1, 295.)

And because "*infection spreadeth upon that which is sound and tainteth it.*"

(*Essay IX.*)

"Pursue him to his house and pluck him thence;
Lest his infection, being of catching nature,
Spread further."

(*Coriol.*, *III*, 1, 309);

and so, cause a general taint of the whole state.

A gangrenous law is another disease in a state "like to infection."

"*Obsolete laws that are grown into disuse,*"

(*De Aug.*, *VIII*, *III*, 57.)

and "Decrees dead to infliction."

(*Meas.*, *I*, 3, 28),

are gangrenous things, and unless they be "rooted out" or "cut away" from the general body of the law "*they bring a gangrene, neglect, and habit of disobedience upon other wholesome laws that are fit to be retained in practice and execution.*" (*Life VI*, p. 65.)

"*For as an express statute is not regularly abrogated by disuse, it happens that from a contempt of such as are obsolete, the others also lose part of their authority, whence follows that torture of Mezentius, whereby the living laws are killed in the embraces of the dead ones.*"

(*De Aug.*, *VIII*, *III*, 57.)

So, too, "The threatening twigs of birch" stuck "in their children's sight for terror, not to use." (*Meas.*, *I*, 3, 24) are gangrenous things; and, because they are not put in execution,

"In time the rod
Becomes more mock'd than fearèd; so our decrees,
Dead to infliction, to themselves are dead,
And liberty plucks justice by the nose;
The baby beats the nurse, and quite athwart
Goes all decorum."

(*Ib.*, *I*, 3, 26.)

"As posteriores leges priores abrogant, so new judgements avoid the former. The records reverent things, but like scarecrows."

(*Life IV*, p. 200.)

"We must not make a scarecrow of the law,
Setting it up to fear the birds of prey,
And let it keep one shape, till custom make it
Their perch and not their terror."

(*Meas., II*, 1, 1);

Otherwise we shall have
"Laws for all faults
But faults so countenanced, that the strong statutes
Stand like the forfeits in a barber's shop,
As much in mock as mark."

(*Ib., V*, 1, 321),

"And turn pre-ordinance and first decree
Into the law of children."

(*J. Caesar, III*, 1, 38.)

Therefore *"above all things a gangrene of the law is to be avoided,"* (*De Aug., VIII, III*, 57), because the law being once gangrened is no longer respected.

The same is true of the body:—

"The service of the foot
Being once gangrened, is not then respected
For what before it was."

(*Coriol., III*, 1, 305.)

And if this foot be not cut off, the infection is apt to spread, and the living parts to be killed in the embraces of the dead:

"This fester'd joint cut off, the rest rests sound;
This let alone will all the rest confound."

(*R2, V*. 3. 85.)

The same is true of the putrid flies and the sweet-smelling ointment:—

These fester'd flies cut off, etc.

But this has been dealt with in the chapter relating to Ecclesiastes *X*, 1.

(*To be continued.*)

BACON AND "MACBETH."

By Henry I. Ruggles.

FRANCIS BACON'S *Advancement of Learning* was published in 1605, probably in the month of October of that year.

The tragedy of *Macbeth* was first performed between October 1604 and 1610, but it is not possible to state definitely when it was written.

The coincidences between passages in the play and in the *Advancement of Learning* are so extraordinary that if Bacon and Shakespeare were different personalities there is no literary parallel to them in any age. We know that Bacon in the *Advancement of Learning* was occupied much with "the knowledges that respect the body and the knowledges that respect the mind" and that, as a student of Nature, he reached certain conclusions "respecting the state and nature of man." These conclusions were identical with those reached by Shakespeare. The investigations which were the subject of the *Advancement* were developed to an abstruse and recondite degree in the Latin translation which was published in 1623, the same year as that in which the First Folio of Shakespeare's plays saw the light.

It is the purpose of this essay to trace the parallels between philosophy and play; much light can be thrown upon the latter by a knowledge of the former and the play itself elucidates the philosophy.

If Shakespeare were another writer, he could have had access, of course, to the theories of Bacon only in the form published in 1605; but, as has been said, these were elaborated with much greater fullness of thought and expression and with considerable additions in the *De Augmentis* of 1623, seven years after the death of Shakspere. My quotations will be from the latter work. The edition made use of is that of Spedding, Ellis and Heath.

In opening the subject of the "Doctrine concerning

man," Bacon says that the ancient oracle directs us to the knowledge of ourselves which is the end and term of knowledge. The doctrine has two parts, one the Philosophy of Humanity and the other Civil Philosophy. The first consists of knowledge which respects the body and of knowledges which respect the mind. The general science concerning the Nature and State of Man is composed of those things which are common to the body and soul and may be divided into two parts; the one regarding the nature of man undivided; the other regarding the bond and connection between the mind and body. Bacon terms the first the doctrine concerning the Person of Man and the second, (i.e., the bond and connection between mind and body,) the doctrine concerning the League.

With regard to the doctrine concerning this league, or common bond between soul and body, that too is distributed into two parts—the first is physiognomy which discovers the disposition by the lineaments of the body, and the second is the interpretation of natural dreams which discover the state and disposition of the body by the agitations of the mind.

Bacon includes motion and gesture under physiognomy because, he says, the lineaments of the body disclose the dispositions and inclinations of the mind in general; but the motions and gestures of the countenance and parts do not only so, but disclose likewise the seasons of access and the present humour and state of the mind and will.

Both physiognomy and the interpretation of dreams are, according to Bacon, arts of prediction, and when we look at the play from this point of view we shall see in the first place that these two arts of prediction are part of the subject of *Macbeth* and contribute to the unity of the great drama's effect. The action originates in the prophesies of the witches and quite early in the play we have a direct reference to physiognomy as an art. The King, speaking of the rebel Cawdor, says

"There is no art
To find the mind's construction in the face."

There is another scene in which physiognomy is used

with the greatest effect, namely, that in which Macbeth, boasting that his mind can never sag with doubt or shake with fear, is dismayed by the messenger who announces the advent of the English army concealed by the boughs of trees:—

Macbeth: "The devil *damn thee black*, thou *cream-faced* loon!
Where got'st thou that *goose look*?
Servant: There is ten thousand—
Macbeth: Geese, villain?
Servant: Soldiers, sir.
Macbeth: Go prick *thy face* and *over-red thy fear*.
Thou *lily-liver'd boy*. What soldiers, patch?
Death of thy soul! those *linen cheeks* of thine
Are *counsellors to fear*. What soldiers, *whey-face*?
Servant: The English force, so please you.
Macbeth: *Take thy face hence*.— . . ."

There are many other direct allusions to physiognomy as an art of prediction, as Bacon calls it, in the play. There is Lady Macbeth's advice to her husband "To *beguile* the time, *Look like the time*," his *face* being a *book* where *men* may *read strange matters*; there is the scene in which Lady Macduff, who has been warned of the near approach of danger to herself and to her children and who, surprised by the entrance of the murderers, exclaims, "*What are these faces*?"

Realising the necessity of disarming suspicion, Macbeth, who apparently finds it difficult to keep his countenance, is enjoined by his wife to look up clear; to alter favour ever is to fear and, he, realising the truth of this, mocks the time with fairest show, his false face having to hide what his false heart knew.

Another example of gesture indicating inward emotion is the magnificent scene in which Macduff, hearing of the assassination of his wife and children is advised by Rosse to give sorrow words and not to pull his hat upon his brows.

The other branch of the doctrine of the League, as Bacon calls the bond and connection between soul and body, has

not yet, he writes, been collected into an art, but only comes in dispersedly in the course of other treatises. The consideration is twofold; either "how and how far the humours and temperaments of the body alter and work upon the mind; or, again, how and how far the passions and apprehensions of the mind alter and work upon the body." Of this second part of the doctrine of Impression (Bacon calls the second branch of the doctrine of the League this) the play is, as indeed are all the plays, full of illustrations. In addition to all the common examples of the effects that the mind works upon the body or its organs, such as the beating of the heart with desire, the stiffening of the hair and trembling, we should expect to find, as we do find, extraordinary examples in this tragedy in which the influence of Mabeth's imagination over his senses, as in his vision of the dagger and of the ghost of Banquo.

The crowning illustration of the influence of the mind over the body is of course to be found in the sleep-walking Lady Macbeth.

It is remarkable, too, that Macbeth, the Highland warrior, inured it seems to blood and battle, dreams and is moreover afraid of dreams. In fact, after he has murdered Duncan, he is prepared to

"Let the frame of things disjoint, both the worlds suffer
Ere we will eat our meal in fear, and sleep
In the affliction of these terrible dreams
That shake us nightly: better be with the dead,
Whom we, to gain our place, have sent to peace,
Than on the torture of the mind to lie
In restless ecstasy."

The meaning of this is that Macbeth will let the whole fabric of the universe fall to pieces, both earth and heaven pass away rather than suffer as he and his wife have been suffering. The extraordinary metaphor is, of course, derived from the agony of the prisoner tortured upon the rack.

Bacon's intense interest in the subject of dreams is, well known. Sometimes he seems to regard them as prophetic. He gives as an example one of his own,

that his father's house in the country was plastered all over with black mortar, which he dreamed two or three days before his father's death.

With regard to the first head of the doctrine of impression, that is how far the humours and temperament of the body may alter and work upon the mind, Bacon writes that the physicians prescribe drugs to help mental diseases as in the treatment of melancholy and frenzy. An allusion to this is found in the well known passage in which Macbeth asks his wife's doctor

"Can'st thou not minister to a *mind diseased*,
And with *some sweet oblivious antidote*
Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of the *perilous* grief
That *weighs upon the heart*."

And, although the dramatist's purpose required that the doctrine be negatived, the doctor replying "Therein the patient must minister to himself," the allusion is no less remarkable.

Again the influence of drugs over the mind is noticed in Banquo's question,—

"Have we eaten on the *insane root*
That takes the *reason prisoner*?"

Under this head, also, Bacon writes of diet, fasting and asceticism as affecting the soul and adds that abstinence and physical humiliation are not merely ritual but profitable and, here again, there is an echo in the play.

"Revenges burn in them; for their dear causes
Would to the bleeding and the grim alarm
Excite the *mortified man*;"

i.e., a devotee or ascetic who by the mortification of the flesh has purified his mind from passion—is not passion's slave.

"Among those doctrines concerning the League," Bacon writes, "or the concordances between the mind and body, there is none more necessary than the inquiry concerning the proper seats and domiciles which the several faculties of the mind occupy in the body and its organs. . . For the opinion of Plato, who placed the understanding in the brain, as in a castle, animosity in the heart and sensuality

in the liver deserves neither to be altogether despised nor to be eagerly received."

In the ordinary use of language, the names of the organs express the functions or faculties that are attributed to them and such use is particularly marked in *Macbeth*. "My dull *brain* was wrought with *things forgotten*." "Who that had a *heart to love*, and in *that heart*, *courage* to make his love known," etc. The brain, moreover is directly mentioned as the seat or receptacle of the reason, as when Lady Macbeth speaks of the chamberlains, whom—

> "She will with wine and wassel so convince
> That memory, the *warder of the brain*,
> Shall be a fume, and the *receipt* of *reason*
> A limbeck only."

Bacon next proceeds to "the doctrine concerning the body of man," and, health being the body's chief good, he treats of medicine, as the corresponding knowledge or art. Having alluded to the honour which "accrues to medicine from the works of our Saviour, who was the physcian both of soul and body; and as he made the soul the peculiar object of his heavenly doctrine, so he made the body the peculiar object of his miracles," Bacon treats of the "offices of medicine," and concludes with these words: "I receive the doctrine concerning the parts of the human body—the functions, humors, respiration, sleep, generation, the fœtus, and gestation in the womb, growth, puberty, old age, and the like—into the body of medicine; . . . because the human body is in everything the subject of medicine."

That is, he includes physiology under the head of medicine and the functions and processes of life are largely illustrated in the play.

Bacon next takes up the doctrine concerning the soul and after enumerating its different faculties, namely, "understanding, reason, imagination, memory, appetite, will, in short, all with which the logical and ethical sciences deal," he adds, "This part touching the faculties of the mind, has likewise two appendices: . . . . one

of these is the doctrine of natural Divination, the other of Fascination.

"Divination hath been anciently and not unfitly divided into two parts: artificial and natural. Artificial makes prediction by argument, concluding upon signs and tokens; natural forms a presage from an inward presentiment of the mind, without the help of signs. Artificial is of two sorts: one argues from causes, the other only from experiments, by a kind of blind authority. Which latter is for the most part superstitious; such as were the heathen observations upon the inspection of entrails, the flight of birds, and the like."

Divination, which "argues from causes," is simply that foresight of the mind acquired by reasoning from cause to effect, and is exemplified in all the characters of this piece. It is marked even in the childish prattle of Macduff's boy:—

Lady Macduff: Now God help thee poor monkey! but how wilt thou do for a father?

Boy: If he were dead, you'd weep for him; if you would not, it were a *good sign* that I *should quickly have a new father*."

To the latter species of artificial divination, allusion is made in the following passage:—

"*Augurs* and *understood relations* have
By *magot-pies* and *choughs* and *rooks brought forth*
The *secret'st man of blood*."

"Artificial divination of both kinds is dispersed among different knowledges. The astrologer has his predictions from the position of the stars. The physician likewise has his predictions of approaching death, of recovery, of coming symptoms of disease, from the urine, the pulse, the look of the patient, and the like."

Thus we find in the play:—

"If thou could'st, Doctor, *cast*
The *water* of my land, find her *disease*,
And *purge* it to a *sound* and pristine *health*,
I would applaud thee," etc.

Observe that this last instance is hinted at in the

De Augmentis only, the passage standing in the *Advancement* thus: "The physician hath his predictions of death, of recovery, of the accidents and issues of disease."

"Natural divination, which springs from the inward power of the mind," says Bacon, "is of two sorts: the one primitive, the other by influxion. Primitive is grounded upon the supposition that the mind, when it is withdrawn and collected into itself, and not diffused into the organs of the body, has of its own essential power some prenotion of things to come. Now this appears most in sleep, in ecstasies" etc.

A remarkable instance of this species of natural divination is given in Macbeth's vision, or second-sight of Duncan's murder. The prediction of the Witches throws him into a state of mind resembling, or analogous to, an ecstasy, Banquo thus describes him:—

"My noble partner
You greet with present grace and great prediction
Of noble having and of royal hope
That he seems *rapt* withal."

And subsequently Banquo calls the attention of Rosse to Macbeth's trance-like state: "Look, how our partner's *rapt*." This, for poetical purposes, is sufficiently near to a state of ecstasy, and brings the passage into parallelism with the doctrine of Bacon:—

"Why do I yield to that suggestion
Whose *horrid image* doth unfix my hair?
. . . . . .
My *thought*, whose *murther* yet is but *fantastical*,
Shakes so my single state of man that *function*
Is *smother'd in surmise*, and *nothing is*
But what is not."

"Divination by influxion is grounded upon this other conceit; that the mind, as a mirror or glass, receives a kind of secondary illumination from the *foreknowledge* of God and spirits."

This is equivalent to a gift of prophesy through God's grace, and an allusion directly in point is furnished by the play:—

"He hath a *heavenly gift of prophecy*,
And *sundry blessings* hang about his throne
That speak him *full of grace*."

"Fascination is the power and act of imagination intensive upon the body of another." After speaking of the school of Paracelsus, Bacon continues, "Others, that draw nearer to probability, looking with a clearer eye at the secret workings and impressions of things, the irradiations of the senses, the passage of contagion from body to body, the conveyance of magnetic virtues, have concluded that it is much more probable there should be impressions, conveyances, and communications from spirit to spirit, whence have arisen those conceits (now become as it were popular) of the mastering spirit, of the glances of love, envy, and the like."

To this doctrine of a mastering spirit, allusion is made in the following lines:—

"There is none but he
Whose *being I do fear*; and under him
My *genius is rebuk'd*, as, it is said,
Mark Antony's was by Cæsar."

"With this is joined the inquiry," continues Bacon, "how to raise and fortify the imagination; for if the imagination fortified have so much power, it is worth while to know how to fortify and exalt it. And here comes in crookedly and dangerously a palliation and defense of a great part of ceremonial magic. For it may be speciously pretended that ceremonies, characters, charms, gesticulations, amulets and the like, do not derive their power from any tacit or sacramental contract with evil spirits, but serve only to strengthen and exalt the imagination of him who uses them."

Illustrative of this, poetically treated, is the incantation scene, "the ceremonial magic" of which fortifies Macbeth's imagination in the hope and belief that he is secure from harm at mortal hands.

It will thus be perceived that the leading points of doctrine concerning man, laid down in the three chapters of the Fourth Book of the *De Augmentis* (all of which are

set forth, though more briefly, in the *Advancement*, with the exception of "the doctrine concerning the person of man," not yet considered), are introduced by way of example or allusion into this tragedy. These points are: 1. Physiognomy. 2. The influence of the mind upon the body, as in somnambulism. 3. The influence of the body upon the mind, as the influence of drugs upon the mental affections, or the effect of diet and fasting upon the passions. 4. Medicine and physiology. 5. Artificial divination, which draws its predictions from signs, that is, foresight, or reasoning from causes to effect. 6. Artificial divination by augury or flight of birds. 7. The predictions of experts in their own art, instanced in those of the physician. 8. Natural divination through the mind's own power, or second sight. 9. Natural divination by influx or the gift of prophecy. 10. Fascination, or the doctrine of the master-spirit. 11. Effects of ceremonial magic in fortifying the imagination.

These parallelisms might be pushed further by taking a wider range in Bacon's writings, and, indeed, without going out of the *De Augmentis*. For instance, in this very same third chapter of the Fourth Book last quoted from, Bacon speaks of the doctrine of voluntary motion, and alludes to the fact that "the imagination is as it were the director and driver of this motion, insomuch that when the image which is the object of this motion, is withdrawn, the motion itself is immediately interrupted and stopped, as in walking, if you begin to think eagerly and fixedly of something else, you immediately stand still," etc. Of this doctrine there is no mention made in the *Advancement*; yet it receives a remarkable, though poetically exaggerated illustration in the air-drawn dagger that points Macbeth the way to the murder of the king:—

"Thou *marshal'st* me *the way that I was going*,
And *such* an *instrument* I was to use.
. . . There's no such thing:
It's the *bloody business* which *informs*
Thus to mine eyes."

So, too, the doctrine which Bacon lays down in the

Seventh Book of the *De Augmentis*, as the ground of morality, namely, that there is in every creature an appetite to two natures of good, that is, "self-good" and "good of communion," calling respectively for the exercise of self-love and benevolence, is precisely that system of morality on which the whole play is founded.

Now if it is argued that Shakespeare's all-fathoming intellect seized upon some parts of this doctrine without aid from Bacon's science, he also produced the whole play, with its special allusions to physiognomy, and divination, and fascination, and voluntary motion, and the reciprocal influences of body and mind, without suggestions from even such parts of the philosopher's well-digested system as were within his reach. If this be true, it presents one of the most extraordinary facts in the history of the human mind. It makes necessary the conclusion, that two men, living contemporaneously in the same town, then a comparatively small city,—one a philosopher, endowed with a most brilliant imagination, the other a most imaginative poet, possessing the profoundest philosophical genius, and both reckoned among the greatest thinkers that the world ever saw,—did, at the same time, and possibly in the same year, and certainly at the same period of their lives, write, without any interchange of views or opinions, upon the same identical subject, follow the same train of thought, arrive at the same conclusions, and digest the results of their study, reading, and meditation, into the same system or body of philosophy, the which one stated to the world in abstract scientific proportions, while the other embodied it in poetic form and dramatic creation. No coincidence of mental action so remarkable as this can be found, it is believed, in any other age of the world, however prolific of genius.

THE PAINTINGS OF THE ANCIENTS.

By Alicia A. Leith.

PRIVILEGED as I am to be reading from a book more than three hundred years old, I hold myself still luckier to believe it is the work of Francis Bacon. One of his editors, Tenison, gives us a broad hint how to discover Bacon, though he should pose under a pseudonym; and the Archbishop finds Bacon's style so individual that it may be detected behind any mask.

The book under consideration is entitled *The Paintings of the Ancients* and appears to have been written first in Latin by "Franciscus Junius F.F.," and then Englished by him with some additions and alterations. It was printed by Richard Hodgkinson and sold by Daniel Frere at the sign of the Bull in Little Britain, 1638. A somewhat significant hint as to the identity of the author is given by the name "Franciscus." As its title suggests, the book deals principally with the art of painting; and, with the culture and taste of a draughtsman and painter, the author discusses painting and statuary, showing intimate knowledge and appreciation of the connection between these two arts. He also emphasises to the somewhat ignorant world of the 17th century the necessity for an artist to work under the beneficent influences both of Nature and of Law. Each of these, says "Franciscus Junius" authoritatively, must have its share in the productions of a painter. We find, too, that our author displays the same intimate knowledge of dramatic as of pictorial art. His personal experience of the Stage is most interesting. The folly and ignorance of audiences amuses him; likewise their inability to judge between the best and worst of plays.

Among the many names of ancient classical authors that are thickly sprinkled on the pages of this book, we find again and again that of Quintilian; and for his writings real affection is shown by "Franciscus Junius." We may call to mind that Quintilian was a favourite author with Sir Nicholas Bacon, the father of Francis. In the middle

of a dissertation on Art the author breaks off to say something about poets. He tells us that "at the first entrance of the works they call upon the muses; that their poems, gushing forth as out of a plentiful stream, may, with a gentle stream, refresh and charm the hearts and ears of astonished men." The first of these muses, says our author, "is Cleo," signifying Fame, because the first and greatest motive that stirs in us is a desire for learning. Quintilian seems to insist that artists wrongly owe more to their doctrines of Art than to their own natures; but "Franciscus" is emphatic that nature, or what he calls material for Art, should be drawn from the craftsman himself; and he quotes one of Bacon's favourite poets, Ovid, "There is a God in us." He further says that the arts of painting and poesy are of the same kindred and that "they are very near of the self same nature." Having established this, he goes on to infer that imagination, inspiration and vision are more important in the making of a good craftsman than any doctrines concerning art. This view might be applied to Shakespeare, who was at first condemned by many for not adhering to the laws of dramatic art, and for introducing a new freedom in this respect. With what appears to be a touch of personal experience, the author shows how an artist may differ in his own productions from the laws laid down by past teaching and yet be correct and admirable.

Another wise saying of Quintilian might suggest Shakespeare: "The learned understand the reason of art and the unlearned feel the pleasure"; and again the author deplores the fact that theatre audiences applaud the least commendable thought in Plays. Here speaks the dramatist, or at least one who was keenly observant of the stage. Popular theatres and Plays are as much noted by this author as the Studio and the Picture Gallery. He dilates with a poet's pen on "the meadows, forsooth, garnished with flowers . . . the most pleasant tapestries of the fields, the Heavens distinguished with stars and clouds." Then follows "the uncertain shapes of clouds most commonly are likened unto anything our wandering mind

conceiveth''; which is reminiscent of the talk between Hamlet and Polonius about the cloud shaped like a camel or a whale.

One out of many references to the Bible—with which ''Franciscus Junius'' seems to be very familiar—is that in which he alludes to Lot's wife; and he appears to exhibit technical knowledge of a certain salt which turns into a ''durable material that withstandeth iron.''

Coming back to the art of painting, the author considers the work of earlier ages more original than that of his own time, as though painters were lacking in boldness for fear of censure and because of being too much tied by rules of Art. As Francis Bacon imparted a fresh urge to Science, so here ''Franciscus'' is deeply concerned with the rebirth of Art; and we may remember how in the frontispiece to D.. Sprat's *History of the Royal Society* a figure evidently meant for Bacon is described as ''Artium Instaurator.'' It was in Bacon's lifetime that a new element became apparent in Art; a new boldness and freedom in treatment, a greater love of nature, are very striking characteristics of that Art. Raphael gives way to Tintoretto and Francesco Bassano. The curtain rung down on the artificial rises for the crowning of Nature, and a new Birth of Time appears on the stage. ''Franciscus'' rejoices that ''Nature is not so much wearied and worn out that she should now bring forth no praiseworthy thing''; and he quotes an old classical writer as saying ''Peace is a gracefull mother of Good Art''; adding on his own account, ''The fatal stirrs of Kingdoms and Republics do mightily dash that constancy of our minds.'' Disraeli* says of Bacon that his poetical, fanciful conceptions that ''served for a model for many succeeding writers''; and his remark that Bacon sought to follow Nature ''through her paths to be her servant and interpreter.'' Disraeli also finds Bacon ''inventing the *Novum Organum* to invent Art,'' and says that his works are in the hands of artisans and artists, who are ''to learn from them to think, to observe and to invent.''

*Amenities of Literature, Vol. II. Bacon.

Through this volume the author would have us believe that for all True Art there must be, for its expression, a combination of Nature and Art. Nature must follow the directions of Art, but what is *most* important is "that Art must be ready to follow most previous Nature."

In conclusion, we may bear in mind that George Herbert, Public Orator of Cambridge, said of his friend Francis Bacon that he was "Master of all Arts and Priest of all Souls." What of "Franciscus Junius" and his *Paintings of the Ancients*?

We deeply regret to hear of the death, at the age of 72, of Mr. W. Parker Brewis, Newcastle-on-Tyne. Mr. Brewis was an archæologist with an expert knowledge of bronze age weapons, being the author of several notable monographs on this subject. He was a member of the Societies of Antiquaries of London and of Newcastle-on-Tyne, serving on the council of the former and as vice-president of the latter.

Mr. Brewis was M.A. (honoris causa) Durham University: and was in 1937 awarded the O.B.E. as an acknowledgment of the assistance he had rendered to the Government in the administration of the Ancient Monuments Acts and was a freeman of the City of Newcastle-on-Tyne.

He had prepared for publication a re-statement of the Bacon theory, of the truth of which he was fully convinced. During his last illness he was able to approve the final drafts of his MSS: if it is published it will be found to be an interesting contribution to the controversy as to the real authorship of Shakespeare. Mr. Brewis before his death presented a fine copy of the Fourth Folio to the Bacon Society which is a valuable and greatly appreciated addition to its Library.

THE SHREWSBURY MS.

By PARKER WOODWARD.

ACCORDING to a local history of Shrewsbury there is at the Free School a manuscript which belonged to the Revd. I. Dychar, Vicar of Shrewsbury, 1555-1615. In the margin at the top of the first page is the following entry:—

"Henry Roido Dudley Tuther Plantagenet filius Q.E. reg. et Robt. Comitis Leicestr."

An attempt has evidently been made to rub out the entry, and further entry down the page is cut out.

There is a local tradition about a boy of some rank and mystery having been educated at Shrewsbury school.

By the side of Earl Leicester's tomb in the Beauchamp Chapel, Warwick, is the elaborate tomb of a young boy. According to the inscription the boy is stated to have been sonne of Robert, Earl of Leicester and nephew and *heir* unto Ambrose, Earl of Warwick . . . . a *child of great parentage taken* . . . . in his tender age at Wanstead in Essex on Sunday the 19th of July.....1584.

The biographers seem to have assumed the boy to have been a child by Leicester's wife Lettice, widow of Walter, Earl of Essex, to whom Leicester was married in September, 1578. But the inscription makes no mention of the child's mother, nor does it give the child's age! If a child of Lettice before marrige, he could not have been heir to the Earl of Warwick. If a child of Lettice after marriage he could not have been more than five when he died. In the engraving of the tomb in Dugdale's *Antiquities of Warwickshire* he has the length of a boy of twelve.

Queen Elizabeth had an attack of vomitting in March 1571-2 (see Nicholl's Progress of Elizabeth) and an illness of about a fortnight in October 1572, so serious that Leicester watched at her bedside. On recovery she took

the unusual course of writing to one of her Court nobleman to say that she had had an attack of small-pox which had not been severe and had been accompanied by spots but no marks had been left.

There is a tradition that the young widowed Lady Sheffield, half-cousin to the Queen, had more than one child by Essex. Also that one child was born in 1572.

In the reign of James I, Robert Dudley, son of Lady Sheffield, whom Leicester had in his Will recognised and benefitted as his base son, commenced proceedings in Chancery to prove that he was legitimate, that his mother and the Earl plighted their troth—in December 1571, and were actually on 23rd May, 1573, married two days before his (Robert Dudley's) birth.

These proceedings were, strange to say, summarily stopped by order of the Star Chamber, the depositions impounded and sealed up and Robert Dudley sent to live abroad.

Is it possible that enquiry into the facts might have disclosed the birth of another child of the Queen by Leicester who was taken away and fostered by the Queen's half-cousin, young Lady Sheffield—Leicester being given out to be the father. Leicester's association with Shrewsbury School was a close one. His nephew Philip Sidney was educated there.

"Henry Roido" may be a misreading in a partly obliterated entry for Henry Robert which would have been an appropriate name for a son of the Queen and Leicester.

REVIEWS.

THE GREAT DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM. By Charles Richard Cammell. (Collins, 21s.)

Baconians will not share Mr. Cammell's unqualified admiration of George Villiers, first Duke of Buckingham. That many contemporary tributes were paid to his greatness, his goodness and sweetness of disposition cannot be denied, but to the characters of those in high place men were to virtues over kind and to faults more than a little blind, especially when the eulogists were actuated by a lively sense of favours to come from an all-powerful Favourite.

We know that so hardly had the people borne the King's grants to Buckingham, and through him to his family and friends, that Parliament had to set up a chase that might have run him to earth had he not turned to run with the hounds.

It is pleasant, however, to remember that there was one dissentient to the sentence of the House of Lords upon Francis Bacon—he was George Villiers; for that one moment the Duke stood by his mentor and friend, whose fall Mr. Cammell writes "is one of the greatest spiritual tragedies in the history of mankind. To blame such a being is childish: all censure is an impertinence."

THE STORY OF ANNE WHATELEY AND WILLIAM SHAXPERE as revealed by "The Sonnets to Mr. W.H." and other Elizabethan Poetry. By William Ross. (Glasgow: W. & R. Holmes. 7*s*. 6*d*. net.)

The author is a Fellow of the Royal Institute of British Architects, The Chartered Surveyors' Institution and The Royal Incorporation of Architects in Scotland. He discloses no other qualification to the solution of one of the most fascinating literary problems—that of the authorship of the Shakespeare Sonnets—except originality. He thinks that Anne Whateley wrote them: that "Mr. W.H." was Shaxpere and the "black woman" Anne Hathaway, his wife, and that the Sonnets are Anne Whateley's record

of the eternal triangle in which the trio were involved. Mr. Ross' book must be read to be believed. It is not a work of fiction: the author assures us he has tried to eliminate any unfounded suggestions of his own imagining. For every statement he makes, no matter how trivial, there is, he thinks, some basis of authority, explicit or implicit.

Yet we read as early as page 18 that William, as his father's representative, travelled the countryside collecting orders and delivering goods: one of his places of call was a secluded country house in Temple Grafton. What authority is there, explicit or implicit, for this portrait of the young, handsome, open and frank Shaxpere at 17 years of age as a commercial traveller? His customers were nuns who became interested in William's beauty, smile and wit and one day Sister Anne gave him a Sonnet.

"From fairest creature we desire increase."

On his next visit he thanked her and was given another. And so friendship becomes love. Anne Whateley cannot marry: her vows prevent it, and William, no more than a gay deceiver, becomes infatuated with the other Anne. Yet a licence was granted to him to marry Anne Whateley: she wanted to save him from himself, but his soul was corrupted in a squalid domesticity and she writes "Tired with all these, for restful death I cry." Dispirited, lifeless, ill, poor Anne Whateley cries "No longer mourn for me when I am dead." But she does not die. She lives to write as Edmund Spenser.

Mr. Ross' method is peculiar. He makes certain verbal changes, substituting "she" and "her" for the masculine equivalents "he," "him" and "his."

Anne Hathaway versus Anne Whateley is, of course, the theme of the Dark Lady sonnets, as they are called. William's wife is black in soul, lustful, cruel and selfish, in striking contrast to the sweet Anne of tradition. Shaxpere leaves her in 1585 and goes to London, forming some connection with the Inns of Court. He is involved with money lenders from whom Anne Whateley rescues him. The marriage of their two minds bore fruit in the Works of William Shakespeare.

Shaxpere was but a pilferer of other men's ideas and merited stoning for literary theft; but she, inflamed with the spirit of poetry, gave and gave lavishly to all and sundry the inspiration that was hers alone. We are not provided with any authority, explicit or implicit, and we are not a little astonished. We hope to hear more from Mr. Ross of the Woman Shakespeare.

A WANDERER WITH SHAKESPEARE. By Russell Thorndike. (Rich & Cowan. 15s.)

In this book the author invites us to take the Shakespeare plays and wander in the steps of his British scenes. This is by no means an easy task because there are very few scenes of any kind whatever in Shakespeare, and these, as surely Mr. Thorndike knows, are unlocalized. It was not until 1709 that Rowe gave, sometimes very unsatisfactorily, a local habitation to Acts and scenes for which he and he alone was responsible. Mr. Thorndike, who is an actor, has been led astray by modern editors: has he ever examined the First Folio or a facsimile? If so, he will surely have seen that, except in a few cases, there are no divisions into Acts and scenes, and to invite us to wander in "locations," to borrow the language of the cinema, in scenes laid in Kent, Windsor and the rest, as if Shakespeare had these in mind, is to walk not with the guide book of his Imagination, but with that of his editors and of Mr. Thorndike.

We start in the lovely little town where he was born and to which he retired to die. A place of inspired scenes and people that fill up so many of his plays. It is difficult to recognise the "most dirty, unseemly, ill-paved, wretched looking town in all Britain," as Garrick described Stratford more than a century after Shakspere lived there, but Mr. Thorndike writes perhaps of Stratford to-day. Even so, one would hesitate to describe it as a lovely little town of inspired scenes and people. The nature of the inspiration is not defined. We presume that the author does not refer to that spirit (or should we say ale?) which has transformed the High Street or designed the "Jam Factory," as the Memorial Theatre is irrever-

ently called, with its fearsome curtain and shocking acoustics.

It is quite certain, writes Mr. Thorndike, that Shakespeare's first journey took place within the little house of wood and plaster where he was born in Henley Street. Is it? The little house was not of wood and plaster, but a hovel of mud and sticks, without chimneys or glazed windows, and it is very uncertain indeed that the Stratford Shakspere was born there.

Mr. Thorndike proceeds to imagine the infant William mewling and puking at the beamed ceiling while relatives and neighbours gape at his baby face just as visitors now gape at the bust in the corner of the room. And so on to his education, first by his erudite mother: it is good to think that she taught him his sure touch with the character of his high born ladies. This is the language of romance. It will be remembered that Mary Arden was, in fact, quite illiterate or, as Sir Sidney Lee wrote more politely, was apparently without education; several extant documents bear her mark and there is no proof that she could sign her name.

However, Mr. Thorndike thinks we are bound to imagine little Will learning at his mother's feet; watching the players from between his father's legs; seeking knowledge for the making of plays, and, at 18 years of age, meeting Ann Hathaway upon a little path leading to the door of another picturesque cottage, timbered and thatched and fortunately still preserved to us, and marrying her though she was country bred and uneducated and not the woman to accompany her gifted husband to London. Why has Mr. Thorndike written all this? It is sad stuff indeed. But we soon leave biography, if such this can be called, and we are given once more the story of the plays, with long quotations familiar to every reader of Shakespeare and with a great deal of theatrical reminiscence and chatter and long extracts from Holinshed and Stowe. Although the photographs are very good, we think the price of this book might have been better spent, even before the advent of National War Bonds.

MAKE FAME A MONSTER. By E. H. Clements. (Hodder & Stoughton, 8*s*. 3*d*. net.)

This is a detective story, the setting of which is a village on the border of the Cotswolds in Worcestershire. The authoress had Stratford-on-Avon in her mind, and makes of "*Melting*" a parallel instance of a hitherto obscure little place living on the tradition of a 17th Century poet and dramatist named Edward Drewis, Druwys, Druis or Drews, as "they can't even make up their minds how to spell his name!"

It appears that this Drewis, whose father was a blacksmith, went to London to seek his fortune and achieved a posthumous fame by means of plays and lyrics published in his name. "The Scholars," says the heroine, Rosalind, "are faced with a man whose life was nearly a blank—seeing things that aren't really there. Like Shakespeare it's all a surmise. Nobody knows." However, out of nescience have evolved great vested interests—a Memorial Library, a Theatre, a Tomb, Hotels, Inns, Tea Gardens, where they "do not blush to charge 2s. 6d. for the privilege of drinking out of cups that bear Edward's counterfeit presentment stamped upon them."

Sir William Lorimer is the chief benefactor and President of *The Drewis Trust*. We are told that he rebuilt the Theatre and that it is his privilege to lay the wreath on the tomb at the annual Festival. For this "the village is booked up months in advance." The Memorial Library is stacked with biographies of Drewis and books, the subjects of which are such hotly debated controversies as, whether the poet was lame and, if so, in which leg!

The "Birthplace" has its professional custodian and attracts crowds of gaping tourists from all parts of the world. Prosperity is therefore conspicuous throughout the village.

At the height of the Festivities appears an American, Valentine Chadd, with secret documentary evidence that Drewis was a myth. Information as to his intentions to destroy it leak out and reach the ears of those vitally interested in maintaining the tradition. Chadd's docu-

ments are stolen from his room at the Hotel and he himself is found dead a few hours later under very mysterious circumstances. Here the satire ends and the detection of crime begins.

This is a cleverly thought-out book, well-written and with a story which holds interest to the last page.

When the search for Spencer's tomb was undertaken, newspaper articles appeared, discussing what would happen if the author of the plays and poems were proved not to have been the Stratford actor. Probably the authoress was impressed by this, for of the "*Melting*" tradition her heroine asks, "Suppose it cracked? what would be the result of such a crack?" The title of the book is Baconian and occurs in this extract from the Essay "*of Fame*," placed before Chapter I:—

> "The Poets make fame a Monster. . . . . We will therefore speak of these points: what are false Fames: and how they may be best discerned: How Fames may be sown and raised; how they may be spread and multiplied; and how they may be checked and laid dead."

R. L. EAGLE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

8th August, 1940.

To the Editors, "Baconiana."

Dear Sirs,

In the article "The Rose Croix Degree," it is stated that "no satisfactory explanation of the word HEREDOM has been given."

It is certain that no explanation of any word can be obtained by simply quoting other writers using the same word, but differently applied in usage and sense.

To know the origin and true meaning of words, their *sources* must be discovered by tracking evolutionary stages; an intricate philological process.

"HEREDOM" is derived from the ancient Egyptian astro-theological mystic rites, under the Veil of ISIS, the goddess Queen of Heaven, described in three hieroglyphical signs; wisdom, beauty, perfection.

Isis becomes Juno and identical with Ceres whom the Greeks named "EPE"; and as the Greek letters E and P equate with the capital letters H and R, these give the first syllable, "HERE."

The second syllable, "DOM", signifies the state of, or being, as in king-domo and in the same original Isiac mysteries, the letters D.O.M. implied "The Great Goddess," Isis, queen of all life in heaven and earth.

The Romans appropriated from the Greeks, and the Greeks borrowed from the Egyptian Priests this secret Isaic title:—Δ; D, the Lord, Ruler; O the Sun's disc, glory; M wavy water sign, life; Queen of all Life, represented by these three mystical letters, D.O.M., which are now used in religious "offices" as Deo Optimo Maximo.

The Rose evolved from the Egyptian Lotus, the flower consecrated to ISIS, and denotes the mystical ideas; discretion, secrecy and silence.

It is well known that the Cross originated in Egypt as the Crux Ansata, the ancient sign, not of sacrificial death, but LIFE and Royal Power.

I.N.R.I. is not a word, but the initial letters of the four passwords; Iamin, Nour, Rouach, Iebeschal; meaning Water, Fire, Air and Earth, used by the "Holy Brethren, passed over"; the Hebrews, imitators of the Egyptian secret brotherhood, MA-SEN. The letters I.N.R.I. form the Christian tetragram; Jesus, Nazareth, King (REX), Jews; the letters I and J equate.

W. A. VAUGHAN.

NOTES AND NOTICES.

The effect of the war upon the Stratford racket has been unfortunate indeed. It was, of course, to be expected that the Birthday celebrations must be shorn of their accustomed splendour, but reports presented to the Governors of the Memorial Theatre are more than a little surprising. They disclosed that while expenses last year were £2,000 higher, box office receipts and profits on catering at the theatre showed a decrease of about £8,000. Festival performances showed a loss of £4,535 against a profit in the previous season of £4,761. The surplus on the year was £1,506 as against £12,704 on the previous year; but, Lord Iliffe, who presided, said, they could congratulate themselves and thank Sir Archibald Flower that they had a surplus at all.

At the annual meeting of the Birmingham Shakespeare Memorial Library the secretary reported that the library now contains 28,911 volumes in 57 languages. Interesting additions include an edition of "Romeo and Juliet" in Persian, and an edition of "Julius Cæsar" in Yoruba. Mr. W. H. Moore, an expert on the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy, has presented 39 more volumes of manuscripts of his Baconian studies, making a total of 60 volumes. Mr. Moore published in 1934, under the title "Shakespeare," an elaborate study of *Love's Labour's Lost* and of cipher signatures of Bacon he claimed to have discovered in that play.

The fame of the Bacon Society travels far: readers will be interested in the following extracts from the Press:—

Good Men Sleep at Home is the work of Walter Ellis, who, as you know, wrote the farce of the last war, *A Little Bit of Fluff*.

Mr. Ellis's deepest interest, however, is far removed from the writing of farces. He is a devout and enthusiastic member of the Baconian Society and has written a clever booklet in support of its theory. The Baconian Society, it may be permissible to add, has nothing to do with the

rationing system or the cultivation of pigs, but is solely concerned with the idea that the plays of Shakespeare were written by Francis Bacon.

This is from the *Daily Mirror* of April 12th, 1940, and this from *Horse and Hound* of April 26th:—

The Bacon-Shakespeare controversy still rages among our literary people, but it would seem that Shakespeare certainly made play-writing pay. And, further, he did not lose his head in the swirl of London society. No small feat this for a country lad. All we know of England's greatest poet seems to point to the fact that he was a man of ordinary tastes, and his only outstanding merit was the great gift he had of seeming to get into the skin of his characters. That he was successful is evidenced by the fact that lawyers say he must have had some legal training to depict his legal scenes, and sailors affirm that no seaman could give directions more correctly than he did in his sea scenes.

This humour is of the unconscious variety.

Notes and Queries, 13th July, 1940, is in more serious vein:—

The case of the Baconians is most admirably set forth in George C. Bompas's work, *The Problem of the Shakespeare Plays* (London: 1902). George Bompas was the senior partner in one of the leading firms of solicitors in London, and he set out his case as only an eminent and able lawyer could do it. Sir E. Durning Lawrence set forth the Baconian theory in his work, *Bacon is Shakespeare* (New York: 1910), and this was violently answered in C. R. Hand's *Shakespeare not Bacon* (Liverpool: 1913). The most temperate and reasonable summing up is contained in G. Hookham's *Will o' the Wisp, or the Elusive Shakespeare* (London: 1922).

If I may be allowed, as a minnow among these tritons, to express an opinion and to make a suggestion, I would found it upon the "Origins" to be found in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, and would compare the Folio of 1623 with the late Mr. Lacy's "Acting Editions" of hundreds

of plays. No one would suggest that he was the author of any of them. One might elaborate this argument for several of your columns. This is merely an adumbration of what might be done, but "the brain reels" at the mere thought of it.

EDWARD HERON-ALLEN.

The comparison between the Lacy Acting editions with those of Shakespeare is sound, but it should have been with the Quarto editions of separate plays, not with the great collection in folio.

The late Duke of Rutland, who died in April last, was present during the unsuccessful excavations at Westminster Abbey to locate the tomb of Edmund Spenser.

The Duke himself was named some years ago as a descendant of the "author" of Shakespeare's works, for in 1935 a German writer suggested—but failed to prove satisfactorily—that the plays should be attributed to Roger Manners, Duke of Rutland.

Mr. Ivor Brown, joint author with Mr. George Fearon of "*The Amiazng Monument*," which was so effective an exposure of the Shakespeare Industry and its Stratford headquarters, recently commented in the *Manchester Guardian* on "*Some Tricks of Fame*. He writes:—

Wars or no wars, numbers of the faithful, as well as numbers more of mildly interested lookers-on, will perform or attend certain ceremonials with flags and flowers on Tuesday at Stratford-on-Avon. William Shakespeare provides the student of reputations with the most astonishing example of the time-lag to begin with and of preposterous adulation afterwards. He was buried at Stratford without fuss while men who seem to us in no way comparable went to the Abbey. None of his brother poets and dramatists lamented his passing in the usual way. Warwickshire daffodils were all his bouquets.

The editors and contributors to the Folio certainly put a literary plaque on the writer of the plays seven years later, but Stratford remained placidly unaware of the

treasure it possessed in the birthplace, home, and bones of him whom the anti-Stratfordians prefer to call the actor Shagsper while they are allotting the authorship of Shakespeare's work to Bacon.

The first record of anybody bothering to look at Shakespeare's tomb occurs eighteen years after it was made, when a Lieutenant Hammond of Norwich recorded of Stratford that "a Neat Monument of Mr. William Shakespeare was worthy of the visitor's regard." It was long before many took the lieutenant's advice. John Ward, who was Vicar of Stratford for nearly twenty years (1662-81), had not read the works of Stratford's famous son and jots down that he "must remember to peruse them." Small compliment there to the local hero and now the foundation of an entire Shakespeare industry!

There was plenty of easily exploited local stuff, his mulberry tree to yield a quenchless flow of relics, his swanny river, his courting days at Shottery with its surviving Hathaway homestead, and the increasing store of rapidly manufactured legends about poaching and drinking which agreeably served the English love for the romance of a bad boy "making good." Stratford is a natural beauty spot, a handy shrine. It would have made an enormous difference to the ardours and exercises of Bardolatry if the centre of pilgrimage had been in a remote, ugly, and unromantic place.

There is always a certain amount of luck in these matters. The Shakespeare cult was only established on a national basis about a century and a half after his death.

Consider that astounding "trick of fame" which now puts a plaque on a London building occupying the site of a house whence a man once sent a letter to Shakespeare on the subject of a loan! That, surely, is the very ecstasy of devotion.

This, indeed, is the most astounding trick of all.